EFI 92-58
November 1992

ELECTROWEAK MEASUREMENTS AND TOP QUARK MASS LIMITS[1]

JONATHAN L. ROSNER
Enrico Fermi Institute and Department of Physics, University of Chicago
5640 S. Ellis Ave., Chicago, IL 60637, USA

ABSTRACT

The agreement of electroweak measurements with theory places limits on the masses of the top quark and the W boson. It is shown how these limits arise and what constraints various measurements (particularly a top quark mass determination) would provide on the theory. The degree to which present and future measurements can constrain the Higgs boson mass is examined.

arXiv:hep-ph/9211312v1 25 Nov 1992

1. Introduction

The unified description of weak and electromagnetic interactions has led to a series of predictions which are in accord with all present data, including recent measurements from e^+e^- collisions at the Z mass, $p\bar{p}$ collisions at high energies, deep inelastic scattering of neutrinos, and parity violation in atoms. This agreement is so good that it constrains higher-order effects, particularly that of the top quark mass. In the present paper we examine such constraints in the light of recent data, and extend the analysis of a recent review [1] to parameters S and T which describe effects of new physics [2].

2. Electroweak theory and radiative corrections

The electroweak theory replaces the Fermi coupling constant, $G_F = 1.16637 \pm 0.00002 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV^{-2}, by combinations of dimensionless couplings and masses:

$$\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{g^2}{8M_W^2} \quad , \quad \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{g^2 + g'^2}{8M_Z^2} \quad , \tag{1}$$

where (g, g') are the SU(2) and U(1) couplings. The electric charge e is related to g and g' by $e = g \sin\theta = g' \cos\theta$, so that

$$M_W^2 = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}G_F \sin^2\theta} \quad , \quad M_Z^2 = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}G_F \sin^2\theta \cos^2\theta} \quad . \tag{2}$$

The value of $M_Z = 91.187 \pm 0.007$ GeV [3] then can be used to predict the value of θ in the lowest-order theory, leading to a value of M_W.

The electromagnetic charge when probed at the scale of M_W or M_Z is slightly stronger than that at long distances as a result of vacuum polarization effects.

[1]Presented at DPF 92 Meeting, Fermilab, November, 1992.

The fine-structure constant, instead of being about 1/137, is about 1/128. This modification is crucial in obtaining a value of M_W from the above procedure which is close to the experimental average [4, 5].

The major effect of a top quark mass is a modification of the relation between G_F and M_Z:

$$\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\rho = \frac{g^2 + g'^2}{8M_Z^2} \quad , \quad \rho \simeq 1 + \frac{3G_F m_t^2}{8\pi^2\sqrt{2}} \quad . \tag{3}$$

The quadratic dependence on m_t comes from the top quark's contribution to W and Z self-energy diagrams. No such quadratic dependence appears in the photon vacuum polarization because of electromagnetic gauge invariance. The relation for M_Z in terms of θ now becomes

$$M_Z^2 = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}G_F\rho\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta} \quad . \tag{4}$$

Higgs boson contributions to W and Z self-energies lead to an additional term

$$\Delta\rho = -\frac{3}{8\pi\cos^2\theta}\ln\frac{M_H}{M_W} \tag{5}$$

in ρ. Now, θ, M_W, and other electroweak observables depend on both m_t and M_H. This dependence, along with present bounds on M_W [4, 5], leads for $m_H < 1$ TeV to a crude upper limit of $m_t \leq 200$ GeV. The lower bound on m_t (95% c.l.) is 91 GeV [6]. A measurement of m_t to ± 5 GeV and m_W to ± 50 MeV will begin to distinguish among predictions for various Higgs masses.

Additional terms logarithmic in m_t lead to modifications of the relations written previously:

$$\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} = (1 + \Delta Z_W)\frac{g^2}{8M_W^2} \quad , \quad \frac{G_F\rho}{\sqrt{2}} = (1 + \Delta Z_Z)\frac{g^2 + g'^2}{8M_Z^2} \quad , \tag{6}$$

where ΔZ_W and ΔZ_Z represent the effects of variation with momentum transfer between $q^2 = 0$ (where G_F is measured) and the W and Z poles (where coupling constants and masses are defined). They may be expressed in terms of quantities of order 1:

$$\Delta Z_W = \frac{\alpha S_W}{4\sin^2\theta} \; ; \quad \Delta Z_Z = \frac{\alpha S_Z}{4\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta} \quad , \tag{7}$$

Similarly, $\rho = 1 + \alpha T$ can be expressed in terms of a parameter T of order 1.

If one expands around nominal values of m_t and M_H, one finds [7]

$$T \simeq \frac{3}{16\pi\sin^2\theta}\left[\frac{m_t^2 - (140\text{ GeV})^2}{M_W^2}\right] - \frac{3}{8\pi\cos^2\theta}\ln\frac{M_H}{100\text{ GeV}} \quad , \tag{8}$$

$$S_W = \frac{1}{6\pi}\left[\ln\frac{M_H}{100\text{ GeV}} - 2\ln\frac{m_t}{140\text{ GeV}}\right] \quad , \quad S_Z = \frac{1}{6\pi}\left[\ln\frac{M_H}{100\text{ GeV}} + 4\ln\frac{m_t}{140\text{ GeV}}\right] \quad . \tag{9}$$

3. Electroweak observables and fits

The precise value of the Z^0 mass entails a value of $\sin^2\theta \equiv x_0 = 0.2323 \pm 0.0002 \pm 0.0005$ for $m_t = 140$ GeV, $M_H = 100$ GeV. We expand a set of electroweak obervables

Table I: Electroweak observables incorporated into a fit to the standard electroweak theory.

Quantity	Reference	Experimental Value	Nominal Theory[a)]	Expt. ÷ theory
Q_W (Cs)	b)	-71.04 ± 1.81	-73.20	0.970 ± 0.025
M_W(GeV)	c)	80.14 ± 0.27	80.21[b)]	0.999 ± 0.003
N_ν [from $\Gamma(Z \to \nu\bar{\nu})$]	d)	3.04 ± 0.04	3	1.013 ± 0.013
$\Gamma(Z \to l^+l^-)$(MeV)	e)	83.52 ± 0.33	83.6	0.999 ± 0.004
$\Gamma(Z \to$ all)(MeV)	d)	2492 ± 7	2488 ± 6	1.001 ± 0.004
$\bar{x}$ (asymms., τ pol.)	d)	0.2324 ± 0.0011	0.2322	1.001 ± 0.005
$\bar{x}(q\bar{q}$ asymm.)	d)	0.2323 ± 0.0032	0.2322	1.000 ± 0.014
$\bar{x}(\vec{e}D)$	b)	0.224 ± 0.020	0.2322	0.965 ± 0.086
$\bar{x}(\vec{e}C)$	b)	0.20 ± 0.05	0.2322	0.86 ± 0.22
$\bar{x}\left[\sigma(\nu_\mu^{(-)})\right]$	f)	0.232 ± 0.009	0.2322	1.00 ± 0.04
M_W (MeV) from R_ν	g)	80.32 ± 0.32	80.21	1.001 ± 0.004
$R_{\bar{\nu}}$	b)	0.387 ± 0.009	0.376	1.02 ± 0.02
$\bar{x}$ (A_{LR} at SLC)	h)	0.2378 ± 0.0056	0.2322	1.024 ± 0.024

[a)] For $m_t = 140$ GeV, $M_H = 100$ GeV.

[b)] As in Ref. [1].

[c)] Raised from value in Ref. [1] as a result of new M_Z measurement [3].

[d)] Ref. [3].

[e)] F. Merritt, Seminar, Univ. of Chicago, April, 1992.

[f)] New CHARM II value: Ref. [3] and G. Rädel, this conference.

[g)] Based on CCFR value of $1 - (M_W/M_Z)^2 = 0.2242 \pm 0.0057$ [3].

[h)] C. Baltay, this conference. Value not included in fit.

about this value; details are to be found in Ref. [1]. For example, we have [8]

$$\sin^2\theta - x_0 = \frac{\alpha}{1-2x_0}\left[\frac{1}{4}S_Z - x_0(1-x_0)T\right] = (3.65\times10^{-3})S_Z - (2.61\times10^{-3})T \quad , \qquad (10)$$

and corresponding other expressions for Z partial widths, neutral-current to charged-current ratios in deep inelastic neutrino scattering, and weak charges as measured in atomic parity violation. The data are summarized in Table I.

Based on the data in Table I, we obtain χ^2 for specific values of M_H as a function of m_t. The results are shown in Fig. 1. The minimum χ^2 values for $M_H = (100,\ 300,\ 1000)$ GeV are $(4.34, 4.33, 4.33)$, corresponding to $m_t = (144 \pm 16,\ 160 \pm 15,\ 177 \pm 14)$ GeV. The lack of preference for any particular Higgs boson mass stands in contrast to other fits [9, 10] in which a slight (but not significant) tilt in favor of low Higgs mass occurs. This tilt has been traced to slightly different input values for the forward-backward asymmetry for b quark production and for the leptonic width of the Z.

A fit based on the degrees of freedom S and T of Ref. [2] was also performed. (Here we have assumed $S = S_W = S_Z$, as occurs when one has extra degenerate

Figure 1: Values of χ^2 for fit to 12 electroweak observables. From left to right, the curves correspond to $M_H = 100,\ 300$, and 1000 GeV.

doublets.) The results are shown in Fig. 2.

The elongated nature of the ellipses illustrates the absence of any preference for a specific Higgs mass. One can change the Higgs mass without much penalty as long as the top quark mass changes in a compensating way. For $M_H < 1$ TeV (an approximate upper bound resulting from unitarity), we see from Fig. 2 that one can still only conclude $m_t < 200$ GeV, but with 90% confidence.

4. Conclusions

We have shown that the top quark mass is limited by today's electroweak data to be less than about 200 GeV. Stronger limits are to be mistrusted. A plot in S and T shows no particular preference for any sign of S but implies $S < 1$ at the 90% confidence level. The discovery of the top quark and the measurement of its mass remain the highest priority for obtaining further information about the electroweak theory.

5. Acknowledgements

I thank Ugo Fano, Henry Frisch, John Harton, Chris Hill, John Huth, Bill Marciano, Jim Pilcher, Dorothea Schaile, and Jack Steinberger for helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by the United States Department of Energy under grant No. DE AC02 90ER40560.

6. References

1. J. L. Rosner, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **64** (1992) 1151.

Figure 2: Fit to parameters S and T based on data of Table I. Plotted point corresponds to minimum χ^2; inner and outer ellipses correspond to 68% and 90% c.l. limits. Standard model curves correspond, from left to right, to $M_H = 100,\ 300$, and 1000 GeV. Ticks on these curves, from bottom to top, correspond to $m_t = 100,\ 140,\ 180,\ 220$, and 260 GeV.

2. M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 964; *Phys. Rev. D* **45** (1992) 381.
3. L. Rolandi, Rapporteur's talk at XXVI International Conference on High Energy Physics, Dallas, TX, August 1992.
4. CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **43** (1991) 2070.
5. UA2 Collaboration, presented at DPF Meeting, Vancouver, Canada.
6. CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** (1992) 447.
7. D. C. Kennedy and P. Langacker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 2967; **66** (1991) 395(E).
8. W. Marciano and J. L. Rosner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990), 2963; **68** (1992) 898.
9. D. Schaile, *Z. Phys. C* **54** (1992) 387.
10. J. Harton, invited talk in Session A, this conference.